

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in reply to the non-final Office Action mailed on June 8, 2006. A petition for a one month extension of time is submitted herewith. The Director is authorized to charge \$120.00 for the petition for extension of time and any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112701-441 on the account statement.

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. In response Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, and Claim 2 has been canceled. This amendment does not add new matter. In view of the amendment and/or for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In response, Claim 1 has been amended to address the informalities cited by the Patent Office. Based on at least these noted reasons, Applicants believe that Claim 1 and Claims 2-10 that depend from Claim 1 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,094,236 to Holmes et al. ("*Holmes*"). Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by GB 472,428 to Hirschson ("*Hirschson*"). Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,232,576 to Leich et al. ("*Leich*"). Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-10 are allowable in view of the cited references because they have not been rejected based on prior art. Moreover, the Patent Office has failed to provide support showing that any of the elements of Claims 2-10 are disclosed or even suggested by the cited references. As a result, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 11 to include the elements of Claim 2, which are allowed over the cited references.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites, in part, a control means suited to control the movement of elements of the apparatus, wherein the control means act on a pivot whereon there is keyed a circular sector provided with two pivots that rotate a toothed sector and a compensator both rotating around said pivot of the circular sector. Amended independent Claim 11 recites, in part, a member that controls the movement of at least certain elements of the apparatus, wherein said member that controls the movement of certain elements of the apparatus acts on a pivot whereon there is keyed a circular sector provided with two pivots that rotate a toothed sector and a compensator both rotating around said pivot of the circular sector. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 11 as currently amended are novel, nonobvious and distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and earnestly solicit an early allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Robert M. Barrett
Reg. No. 30,142
Customer No.: 29156

Dated: October 3, 2006